

doing when it comes to children's educational opportunities. I accept the fact there are teachers out there who are not teaching very well and superintendents and school boards that are failing in their responsibilities and parents who are as well.

If all of that is true, don't stand there and tell me that every State is meeting its obligations because they are not. This amendment merely says they ought to. If this bill is going to be fair to everybody, if 94 cents of the education dollar comes from local property-tax payers or State funds and only 6 cents from the Federal Government, and if we are demanding a standard of ourselves on 6 cents, then we ought to demand at least some accountability from our States with the 94 cents they are responsible for when it comes to educational needs at the elementary and secondary level.

As I said a moment ago, many States are doing their best. They are achieving comparable educational opportunity. This is not identical. I am using the words that have been on the books dealing with education issues since 1965. Comparable educational opportunity must exist within school districts. There are school districts that have student populations in their districts which exceed the student populations of most States.

If we demand accountability of school districts numbering hundreds of thousands of kids—that comparable, not identical, comparable—why not ask the States to do that? They lecture us all the time. I have listened to Governors tell us about one problem after another concerning what needs to be done. Is this somehow an immune class from consideration? I don't think so.

This amendment is reasonable. It is not excessive. If we are asking accountability, if that is the mantra on this bill, accountability for everybody—and I agree with that; it is overdue—then States ought to also get in line when it comes to taking that test that we are going to demand of everybody. Over the next 6 years, let everybody become more responsible. Let everybody become more accountable—every child, parent, teacher, school board, superintendent, principal, and, yes, Governor and State as well.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask consent that the time for debate on the Nelson-Carnahan amendment No. 385 be increased from 45 minutes to 60 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. With this consent, the first rollcall vote in the morning will occur at approximately 11:30.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 603, AS FURTHER MODIFIED, AND 517, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments numbered 603 and 517, as previously agreed to, be modified further to conform to the substitute amendment. This has the approval of the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments are so modified.

The amendments (Nos. 603 and 517), as modified, are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 603

On page 506, lines 2 and 3, strike "and other public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations" and insert "and public and private entities".

On page 506, line 9, strike "nonprofit organizations" and insert "entities".

On page 525, lines 18 and 19, strike "and other public entities and private nonprofit organizations" and insert "and public and private entities".

On page 548, lines 24 and 25, strike "nonprofit organizations" and insert "entities".

On page 554, lines 18 and 19, strike "nonprofit private organizations" and insert "private entities".

AMENDMENT NO. 517

On page 309, lines 17 and 18, strike "subsection (f)" and insert "subsections (b), (e) and (f)".

On page 339, line 6, strike "(b)" and insert "(c)".

On page 339, strike lines 7 through 16 and insert the following:

"(b) SCHOOL LEADERSHIP.—

"(1) DEFINITIONS.—

"(A) HIGH-NEED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'high-need local educational agency' means a local educational agency for which more than 30 percent of the students served by the local educational agency are students in poverty.

"(B) POVERTY LINE.—The term 'poverty line' means the income official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved.

"(C) STUDENT IN POVERTY.—The term 'student in poverty' means a student from a family with an income below the poverty line.

"(2) PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a national principal recruitment program.

"(3) GRANTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall make grants, on a competitive basis, to high-need local educational agencies that seek to recruit and train principals (including assistant principals).

"(B) USE OF FUNDS.—An agency that receives a grant under subparagraph (A) may use the funds made available through the grant to carry out principal recruitment and training activities that may include—

"(i) providing stipends for master principals who mentor new principals;

"(ii) using funds innovatively to recruit new principals, including recruiting the principals by providing pay incentives or bonuses;

"(iii) developing career mentorship and professional development ladders for teachers who want to become principals; and

"(iv) developing incentives, and professional development and instructional leadership training programs, to attract individuals from other fields, including business and law, to serve as principals.

"(C) APPLICATION AND PLAN.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, a local educational agency shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. The application shall include—

"(i) a needs assessment concerning the shortage of qualified principals in the school

district involved and an assessment of the potential for recruiting and retaining prospective and aspiring leaders, including teachers who are interested in becoming principals; and

"(ii) a comprehensive plan for recruitment and training of principals, including plans for mentorship programs, ongoing professional development, and instructional leadership training, for high-need schools served by the agency.

"(D) PRIORITY.—In making grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall give priority to local educational agencies that demonstrate that the agencies will carry out the activities described in subparagraph (B) in partnership with nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education.

"(E) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds appropriated to carry out this subsection shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public funds expended to provide principal recruitment and retention activities.

"(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and each subsequent fiscal year.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, am I subject to morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are now in morning business.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 15 minutes in response to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AN EQUAL APPROACH TO EDUCATION

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his very generous comments relative to my role in the Senate. I reciprocate. I admire the Senator from Connecticut immensely. I enjoy him as a colleague, especially his sense of humor and his ability to fashion thoughtful policy with which I sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. It is nice to have him as a colleague and especially to claim him as a fellow New Englander.

He raises an issue that is one of the major debates revolving around the issue of education, both here at the Federal level and at the State level, as he pointed out in citing the New Hampshire Supreme Court decision in the Claremont case which has had a significant impact on New Hampshire's approach to education. I have always believed that decision was wrongly decided, but whether it was wrongly decided or not, it was still the Supreme Court of New Hampshire and, therefore, it is the law of the land in New Hampshire. It was decided based on the New Hampshire Constitution, not on the Federal Constitution. And as such, it is unique to New Hampshire, although there are other States that take the same decision.

This concept that every part within a State must be equal in their approach

to education is something that the New Hampshire Supreme Court has found to be true, or at least to be the law of New Hampshire. But it is not necessarily the law everywhere.

Furthermore, the logic of that, if you were to carry it to its natural extreme, would be that everywhere in the Nation must be the same. If you carry that to its logical conclusion, it would be that in New Hampshire, if town A has a higher property tax base than town B, therefore some of town A's money must go to town B to support town B, thus reducing the money for town A but increasing the money for town B in order to reach equality of funds, which is essentially what the Claremont decision held in its practical application, unless you find new sources of revenue, which is what our State is trying to do right now. Then if you take that to its next logical step, which the Senator from Connecticut appears to be promoting as a concept, this idea of comparability, then why just New Hampshire?

Logically wouldn't the next step be that New Hampshire's funding should be the same as Connecticut, or Connecticut's funding should be the same as Mississippi, that all State districts, all States, all communities across the country should have exactly the same funding or at least comparable funding in their school systems in order to be equal, in order to get quality education, in order to leave nobody behind, in order to have equality of opportunity as has been defined in the law?

I don't think anybody is suggesting that, but that is the logical extension of the logic behind this amendment. Why stop it at the State level? Why stop at the community level? Why go community to community, or county to county? Why wouldn't you step it up to State to State and end up with Connecticut sending money, I presume, to Mississippi, for example, or to Louisiana so that Louisiana standards would come up in the amount of funding, and Connecticut's would go down in the amount of funding?

It doesn't make any sense. Why? Because it doesn't necessarily improve education. Why doesn't it improve education? Because there has been study after study after study—some of the best ones have been done out of the University of Rochester where they have actually studied studies, 300 or so—which have concluded that education is not a formula where more dollars equal better results.

In fact, there are a lot of instances where more dollars simply have not equaled better results. And you don't have to look too far from where we are holding this debate to find that case.

Here in the city of Washington, regrettably, more dollars are spent per pupil than any place in the United States, or for that matter than at any place in all these other industrialized countries that are always listed as being better than the United States in education.

More dollars per student are spent right here in Washington. Yet the quality of the education, the student achievement levels here in Washington are some of the lowest achievement levels of any urban area in the country. So it is not an issue of more dollars produces better education. It has been shown, after innumerable studies—and I have to also say just through common sense, just looking at the situation—that what produces better education is a lot of different factors:

Parental involvement, parents who care about education; teachers who have flexibility in their classrooms to teach the way they think best; good teachers; principals who have flexibility to run their schools the way they think is important; superintendents who have the flexibility to run the school systems; community involvement, with businesses in the community that adopt a school and make it better by committing their employees and their employees' commitments to time and tutorial activity, with support groups such as Big Brothers and Big Sisters supporting people after school so the kids, when not in school, can learn things to help them get through the day when they are in school.

The formula is complex. It is not just more dollars equals better education. So when you set up standards that say everybody has to be paid the same, everybody has to have the same amount of money and you are going to produce better education, that simply doesn't fly. But that is a big argument that we have in this Senate and which is occurring across the country, and also certainly in New Hampshire.

But I think it is one of those red herrings; that if you put more money in the system and bring everybody up to the same money level, you will get better education. That is not true at all. It has been proven time and again.

Unfortunately, one example is right here in Washington, DC. There is no particular reason to pick on Washington, but Washington is a regrettable example of that. So the practical argument, first, is that it doesn't hold water because its logical extension is that every State across the country should have the same funding. Maybe that is the goal in the end. Maybe we are seeing the early steps of an attempt to actually evolve a national system where everybody gets the same amount of money and is targeted the same. But I don't think too many people would follow that course of logic. That would be the practical logic of this amendment carried to its full extreme.

Secondly, the underpinning purpose of the amendment, which is to equalize dollars within a State because that produces better education, also doesn't hold a lot of water because nothing proves that is the case. In fact, just the opposite happens when you use a system that says everybody has to do everything the same. When you put ev-

erybody in a cookie-cutter system of education, you end up with mediocrity; you end up with school systems that, rather than producing quality, end up producing to the lowest common denominator and they fail. They fail the kids. That is what we have seen in our school systems recently.

One of the prior speakers on the other side of the aisle attempted to define my value systems for me. He said my values are to support a system that supports dilapidated schools—or something to that effect—because a community with a dilapidated school doesn't have enough money to support that school and a rich community can have a good school.

That is not my value system. I am sorry it was characterized that way by the Senator from Delaware. My value system on education is that no child is left behind; that the low-income child doesn't get a second-rate education in our system because they go to a second-rate school or they go to a school that failed year in and year out.

What we have done in this country is to have spent \$126 billion on education directed at low-income children and we have not improved their performance at all in 35 years. In fact, the children continue to fail in our system. The average low-income child in the fourth grade today reads at two grade levels less than his or her peers in the same school and across this country.

The simple fact is that we have failed those children. We continue to fail those children because we use this system which believes that a command-and-control system from Washington can actually improve the educational system in local communities. That is not true at all. We need the creativity and imagination and commitment and involvement of the local community leadership—the parents, teachers, principals, and the support systems to focus on making their schools better and do it in a unique way that makes them special.

Every community across the country is going to probably have some original way of doing this. There will be consistencies in text or maybe curriculum in some schools and maybe teaching styles, but each school will be as different as the teachers who are in the schools, the individuals who deal with these kids.

So to try to impose on them a cookie-cutter system that says everybody has to be comparable—they have to do it all the same way or else they don't get their Federal dollars—is to fundamentally undermine the engine that will give these kids opportunities, which is the creativity, originality, and the enthusiasm of the local community, the teacher, the parents, and the principals.

This bill that we have been debating today understands that fact. President Bush has proposed a bill that basically says four things: One is that we are

going to focus on the child and stop focusing on the school system, on the bureaucracy, and on a cookie-cutter comparable standard. We are going to focus on every individual child, especially the low-income child who has been left behind. That is where the dollars are going to flow.

Two, we are going to give the teachers, the community, the local school system flexibility in how they deal with that child and improve that child's capability. In exchange for that flexibility, we are going to require academic achievement by the low-income child. We are not going to let that child be left behind any longer.

Three, we are going to have accountability standards to show that that academic achievement has been accomplished. It is at this point where we put the testing in place, where the President suggested testing in six grades instead of three, as is presently required, to which the Senator from Connecticut feels he has the logic to pursue a comparable standard. He says, if everybody is going to have to be tested—and this was the argument by the Senator from Delaware—then the systems that will bring the child up to a standard of ability to meet the test also have to be comparable.

If everybody is going to be put to one test, then everybody should have comparable support facilities necessary to reach the ability to compete on that test.

The problem is you are essentially saying there can be no creativity in the local school systems, and instead of giving local school systems flexibility in exchange for academic achievement, you are saying we are going to require academic achievement and we are also going to require that we have a bureaucracy that tells you exactly what to do—at least in this amendment—right down to curriculum, range of courses, instructional material, instructional resources—I mean, everything from the time you walk into that classroom is going to have to be comparable with everybody else in the system.

This is a country that takes great pride in individuality, not in being uniform. That individuality is what produces our creativity and strength, whether it is in education or in the marketplace or whether it is in higher learning. Yet this amendment asserts that we should have everything comparable. If you are not comparable, you don't get any Federal money, which says that the Federal Government is coming in and we are going to take the State standard, whatever it is, and force it on every community in that State if they want to get Federal money.

You can call that anything you want, but to me that is a nationalization of the system. You are essentially saying local school systems will be required to do a whole set of activities, from classroom size, to qualifications of teachers, professional staffing, curriculum,

range of courses, instructional material—right down the list. They are going to be required to meet a set of standards which the State may initially set but which the Federal Government enforces. The Federal Government is enforcing this because it is demanding it be met or else the Federal funding doesn't come through—or a portion of it does not come through.

So it is a huge expansion of the role of the Federal Government in deciding exactly what is going to happen at the local school districts. I don't think any of the debate on the other side of the aisle denies that fact.

I think it confirms that fact because basically what the other side of the aisle has been debating—not the whole other side of the aisle but those presenting this amendment and defending it—is, yes, that is right, we have to require that every local community does everything comparable with the other communities in the State to assure equality of opportunity, as they define it.

It is the wrong approach. The President's approach is you get equality of opportunity by assuring the school has the resources but letting the school, the parents, the teachers, and the faculty make the decision as to how the child is educated, and then you test whether or not the child has achieved the goals set out.

If the child has not achieved those goals, then we start putting sanctions on the school systems and start giving the parents some opportunities to give their child additional help through supplemental services in this bill or the States with Straight A's.

The issue of achievement is not done by some arbitrary input system; it is done by actually figuring out in what children are succeeding. As a result, we hopefully change this system which has produced 36 years of failure generation after generation of children who have not had a fair break.

I find it ironic that the Senator from Delaware tried to characterize my values as being for failed schools, dilapidated schools, schools where kids were not learning, when what we propose in this bill is an attempt to reverse what is a clear, undeniable, factual, confirmable point, which is that generation after generation of low-income kids have been left behind.

Even today, after spending \$26 billion, the average low-income child in this country simply is not getting an education that is competitive with their peers in the school system.

While we are on it, let me mention a couple points we put into this bill to give that child a little more opportunity because they have not been talked about much and should be talked about because this bill has interesting and creative initiatives.

There was a package pulled together, negotiated, and agreed to by both sides. It took a long time to do that. It was done under the leadership of Senator LOTT and Senator DASCHLE. Many

of us met for many months to work it out.

I mentioned we had four goals: Child centered, flexibility, academic achievement, and accountability. We set up a structure to accomplish the goals.

A couple things we did I think are creative. We took all the teacher money and merged it and said to the school districts: You pick how you want to improve your teachers. You can hire more teachers; you can improve their educational ability; you can improve their technical support or simply pay the good teachers more. It is your choice. You decide how you do it. We are not going to tell you.

That is a big change because it is giving local districts flexibility over those teacher dollars.

We also said to the small districts in the small school areas, the rural districts, we are going to give you all this money that comes from the Federal Government that comes with these categories, and there are literally hundreds of them. There is a category for arts in some specific area or for language in some specific area.

Most of these little school districts in States such as New Hampshire and Maine—this was an idea of Senator COLLINS—or even in upstate New York or, I suspect, parts of California, cannot access these categorical programs. Why? Because they simply do not have the staff, plus they do not have enough students to draw down enough money to make it worth their time.

We suggested we merge that. We have something called rural ed flex where all this money will flow into these school systems without the strings attached where they can actually get a bang for the dollar, using it effectively.

We also set up something called Straight A's, which is an attempt to give a few States the opportunity to show some creativity with low-income kids. We say we are going to take the formula programs, merge them and you, the State, can take those dollars and spend them however you want, but at the end of the year you have to prove that your low-income children, who are today, remember, not achieving at all—in fact, they are achieving at two grade levels less than most kids—actually achieve a standard that exceeds other kids in their class.

This is an attempt to give a real incentive to States and communities which are willing to be creative to do something about improving the lifestyle and the educational ability of their low-income kids.

Another area we addressed was if a child is in a school that has failed—remember, the States designate whether a school has failed; the Federal Government does not. If the school fails 1 year, we go into the school system under this bill and give it a lot of resources and try to turn it around. If it fails 2 years, we go into the system, start to replace people—under the bill, we give authority to the school system to do that—and put in more resources.

If after 3 years a child is in a school that fails—and by failing, that is defined by the State but essentially it is going to mean that school is not educating the children up to the standards to which the other schools in the community are educating their kids—if a child is in that school for 3 years, if you are a parent, you are pulling your hair out because for 3 years in a row you know your child has fallen behind because they are in a school that does not work. It has been designated as not working by the State or by the community.

What is your option under present law? Nothing. You have to stay in that school unless you happen to be wealthy enough to go to a private school. It is especially a problem for inner-city moms, single mothers raising kids in the inner city, where their kids are going to schools that are filled with drugs and violence, and they have more fear of their life than they have opportunity to learn. Those kids are trapped.

Under this bill, we propose something called supplemental services where, after 3 years in a failing school, a parent is going to have some authority of their own. They are going to be able to take a portion of the money which goes to title I and some other programs and take their child and get services outside the school system. They still have to stay in the public school, but they are going to get services out of the public school system to get their children up to speed academically.

They can go to Sylvan Learning Center, or the Catholic school across the street has a tutorial program in math, they can do that. It will be the parent's discretion to get decent support services. That is going to be a good change for a lot of parents. It is going to be an opportunity for a lot of parents.

There is a lot of good in this bill directed at trying to give low-income kids a better break and a better chance. But the surest and fastest way to undermine the purposes of this bill is to subject it to the cookie-cutter event and to what I think would be a nationalization of that, of requiring comparability from school district to school district to be asserted as a precondition of whether or not you get Federal funds or a portion of Federal funds.

Obviously, I think this amendment represents a very significant undermining of the President's proposal and the agreement we reached through literally hours of intense and very constructive negotiation.

Madam President, I thank you for your courtesy. I especially thank the staff for their courtesy. I yield the floor.

DEDICATION OF THE D-DAY MEMORIAL IN BEDFORD, VIRGINIA

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today along with Senator GEORGE ALLEN and two Members of the House, Representatives BOB GOODLATTE and

VIRGIL GOODE, to place in today's RECORD a moving speech delivered by President George W. Bush in recognition of the 57th anniversary of the historic landing by U.S. and Allied Forces on the beaches of Normandy, France.

The Commonwealth of Virginia was honored when the President selected the small town of Bedford, where a magnificent memorial has just been completed in honor of the extraordinary bravery and sacrifice of the military men and women at Normandy, as the site to deliver this very important speech.

This memorial will serve as an eternal salute to those who so bravely and selflessly fought for freedom. It is often said that June 6, 1944, D-Day, forever changed the course of history. So it is only fitting that such a magnificent structure be erected to remind future generations of that epic chapter in the long European struggle to restore freedom.

The citizens of and soldiers from Bedford earned a unique, but tragic place in history that day. In 1941, the 29th Infantry Division, a National Guard division, was mobilized largely with citizen-soldiers from Virginia and Maryland. Although the division changed over three years, by D-Day, many Virginians took part in the Normandy landing.

The 29th Division's 116th Infantry mounted the first wave together with the 1st Division's 16th Infantry Regiment. They suffered extraordinary casualties. The State of Virginia sustained nearly 800 casualties during the overall landing sequences.

The Bedford National Guard component had formed "A" Company of the 116th and by D-Day, 35 Bedford soldiers were still in the 170-man unit. Nineteen of those young men gave their lives in the first assault wave, and several more died shortly thereafter from wounds. The devastating loss of these young men from a small town of 3,200 left Bedford with the highest per-capita loss on D-Day from any single community not only in Virginia, but the entire United States.

Bedford is a living example of our Nation's many communities who share a common heritage of "Homefront" roles, sacrifices and stories. This community and its citizens serve as a particularly fitting home to this national memorial in recognition of all who participated in this battle and their loved ones back in the United States.

Today's dedication of the National D-Day Memorial was a truly moving ceremony that will long be remembered by those in attendance and those who viewed it by television. The President delivered thoughtful, heartfelt words, truly befitting this solemn, reverent day. On behalf of the Virginian delegation, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the President's remarks be printed in the RECORD for all America to share.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT DEDICATION OF THE NATIONAL D-DAY MEMORIAL

The President. Thank you all very much. At ease. And be seated. Thank you for that warm welcome. Governor Gilmore, thank you so very much for your friendship and your leadership here in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Lt. Governor Hager and Attorney General Earley, thank you, as well, for your hospitality.

I'm honored to be traveling today with Secretary Principi, Veterans Affairs Department. I'm honored to be traveling today with two fantastic United States Senators from the Commonwealth of Virginia, Senator Warner and Senator Allen. (Applause.) Congressman Goode and Goodlatte are here, as well. Thank you for your presence. The Ambassador from France—it's a pleasure to see him, and thank you for your kind words. Delegate Putney, Chaplain Sessions, Bob Slaughter, Richard Burrow, distinguished guests, and my fellow Americans.

I'm honored to be here today to dedicate this memorial. And this is a proud day for the people of Virginia, and for the people of the United States. I'm honored to share it with you, on behalf of millions of Americans.

We have many World War II and D-Day veterans with us today, and we're honored by your presence. We appreciate your example, and thank you for coming. And let it be recorded we're joined by one of the most distinguished of them all—a man who arrived at Normandy by glider with the 82nd Airborne Division; a man who serves America to this very hour. Please welcome Major General Strom Thurmond. (Applause.)

You have raised a fitting memorial to D-Day, and you have put it in just the right place—not on a battlefield of war, but in a small Virginia town, a place like so many others that were home to the men and women who help liberate a continent.

Our presence here, 57 years removed from that event, gives testimony to how much was gained and how much was lost. What was gained that first day was a beach, and then a village, and then a country. And in time, all of Western Europe would be freed from fascism and its armies.

The achievement of Operation Overlord is nearly impossible to overstate, in its consequences for our own lives and the life of the world. Free societies in Europe can be traced to the first footprints on the first beach on June 6, 1944. What was lost on D-Day we can never measure and never forget.

When the day was over, America and her allies had lost at least 2,500 of the bravest men ever to wear a uniform. Many thousands more would die on the days that followed. They scaled towering cliffs, looking straight up into enemy fire. They dropped into grassy fields sown with land mines. They overran machine gun nests hidden everywhere, punched through walls of barbed wire, overtook bunkers of concrete and steel. The great journalist Ernie Pyle said, "It seemed to me a pure miracle that we ever too the beach at all. The advantages were all theirs, the disadvantages all ours." "And yet," said Pyle, "we got on."

A father and his son both fell during Operation Overlord. So did 33 pairs of brothers—including a boy having the same name as his hometown, Bedford T. Hoback, and his brother Raymond. Their sister, Lucille, is with us today. She has recalled that Raymond was offered an early discharge for health reasons, but he turned it down. "He didn't want to leave his brother," she remembers. "He had come over with him and he was going to stay with him." Both were killed on D-Day. The only trace of Raymond Hoback was his Bible, found in the sand. Their mother asked that Bedford be laid to